

From: [Schuster, Cindy](#)
To: [Levine, Carolyn](#); [Holsman, Marianne](#)
Cc: [Schuster, Cindy](#)
Subject: PH call notes 1.29.16
Date: Friday, January 29, 2016 11:52:16 AM

Participants for Sen. Merkley's office: Jake Oken-Berg and Tim Brown

Participants for EPA, Cami Grandinetti, Kristine Koch, Elizabeth Allen, Silvina Fonseca

Asked if RALs are site-wide or for hot spots.

- Cami: Depends on receptors and areas where there is access. Average exposure could expose people to very high concentrations.
Cleanup numbers are what we need to achieve everywhere across the site; some level of exceedance is allowed in some samples.

Asked about cleanup levels at end of construction:

- Cami: PH not designed to achieve cleanup levels at end of construction. Rely on nature to take us down to cleanup goal. RALs are an interim step; all are above the cleanup numbers.

Asked how EPA decides/balances how aggressive to be in remediation.

- Cami: 9 criteria. Less aggressive alternatives have more uncertainty in achieving goal. Look at what remains to be cleaned up, risk remaining at end of construction, cost, RRB looks too. Then we propose remedy, then public comment. Also, if we leave contamination in river, we have to cap and then there are restrictions in river. City has asked us to consider future use when we consider where we'd put caps.

Business asks why spend more if just getting to the same point more quickly.

- Kristine: Public thinks we need to do more, companies think less. Looking at what construction gets us, and residual risk. Know natural recovery will do something.
- Silvina: Longer natural recovery means longer exposure.

Tim asked to what extent proposal will change.

- Cami: RRB was very supportive, but concerned that we were relying heavily on natural recovery. LWG model is flawed in overestimating what river can do. River is difficult to model.

Expressed appreciation for information that helps them talk to others.

Silvina offered D.C. meeting to explain slides to staff.